



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/694,297	10/24/2000	James M. Zombek	003636.0092	1662	
36405	7590 01/19/2	5	EXAM	EXAMINER	
MANNAVA & KANG, P.C. 8221 Old Courthouse Road			BATES, I	BATES, KEVIN T	
Suite 104	itilouse Road		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Vienna, VA	22182		2155		

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/723,285	BONEFAS ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Kevin Bates	2155			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ars on th cov r she t with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 12 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appear Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a cation in		
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of	•				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adviewent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dat have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	ension fee under (2) as set forth in		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI	<u> </u>				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.		
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment		
5.⊠ The a)⊠ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)□ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NC	OT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-55</u> .		•			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. ☐ Other:					
	V	Hotem			
	HOS	AIN ALAM			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The prase "it is my belief" in paragraph 2 does not offer substantial proof that the prior art used in this case is actually meant to be a confidential documents, only that James S Voris believes it was meant to be..